



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

clm

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/533,062

04/28/2005

Tadaaki Tanimoto

TAM-104

3125

24956

7590

10/09/2007

MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C.

1800 DIAGONAL ROAD

SUITE 370

ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

SANDOVAL, PATRICK

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2825

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

10/09/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/533,062	TANIMOTO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Patrick Sandoval	2825	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 April 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 28 April 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>4/28/2005</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Responsive to communication application 10/533,062 filed on 4/28/2005 has been examined. Claims 1-7 are pending.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The information disclosure statement filed 4/28/2005 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each cited foreign patent document; each non-patent literature publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and all other information or that portion which caused it to be listed. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered. Foreign patent documents that were not submitted are by H. Okewatari (AR), S. Kitaguchi (AS), and T. Kitani (AU).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. **Claims 1 and 7 are rejected** under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Flake et al. (Flake) (US 7,035,781) and/or Bowen (US 6,691,301).
5. **Pursuant to claims 1 and 7**, Flake and/or Bowen disclose:

Art Unit: 2825

inputting program descriptions which define a plurality of devices by employing a program language capable of describing parallel operations (Flake, Col. 1, ll. 44-67 – Col. 2, ll. 1-3) (Bowen, Col. 1, ll. 47-61, Col. 9, ll. 63-67 – Col. 10, ll. 1-43);

converting the input program descriptions into an intermediate expression (Flake, Col. 1, ll. 57-67 – Col. 2, ll. 1-3, compiler conversion of language source code) (Bowen, Col. 44, ll. 25-55, compile Handel-C to VHDL);

generating parameters which satisfy a real-time restriction, for the intermediate expression (Flake, Col. 12, ll. 9-67, wrapper parameter) (Bowen, Col. 9, ll. 55-67 – Col. 10, ll. 1-11, requirements, Col. 229, ll. 9-51, behavioral description and varying parameters); and

synthesizing circuit descriptions which are based on a hardware description language (Flake, Col. 6, ll. 3-17, logic synthesis, HDL) (Bowen, Col. 44, ll. 25-55, compile Handel-C to VHDL, RTL synthesis), on the basis of the generated parameters (Flake, Col. 9, ll. 40-67 – Col. 10, ll. 1-25) (Bowen, Col. 229, ll. 9-51, behavioral description and varying parameters).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2825

7. **Claims 2-5 and 7 are rejected** under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Flake et al. (Flake) (US 7,035,781) and/or Bowen (US 6,691,301) in view of Hines (2005/0246682).

8. Flake et al. (Flake) (US 7,035,781) and/or Bowen (US 6,691,301) disclose all of the elements of claims 1 and 6 from which claims 2-5 and 7 depend, respectively.

9. **Pursuant to claim 2**, Flake et al. (Flake) (US 7,035,781) and/or Bowen (US 6,691,301) involve HDL which is behavioral, but do not disclose wherein an intermediate expression is a member selected from the group consisting of a concurrent control flow flag, a temporal automaton with a concurrent parameter, and a temporal automaton with parameters.

10. Hines does disclose programming languages (Hines, Paragraphs 5-7) and also automata (Hines, Paragraphs 649–673, behavioral automata).

11. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to incorporate/combine the behavioral automata of Hines to avoid hazards through the use of built-in causality semantics (Hines, Paragraph 671).

12. **Pursuant to claim 3**, Flake and/or Bowen in view of Hines disclose wherein parametric model checking is performed for the parameter generation (Flake, Col. 15, ll. 28-67 – Col. 16, ll. 1-3) (Bowen, Col. 83, ll. 15-59, compile-time or run-time checking).

13. **Pursuant to claim 4**, Flake and/or Bowen in view of Hines disclose wherein the real-time restriction is given by RPCTL (Hines, Paragraphs 198-205, runtime constraints, runtime algorithms).

Art Unit: 2825

14. **Pursuant to claim 5**, Flake and/or Bowen in view of Hines disclose wherein the program descriptions define the devices by using a "run" method (Hines, Paragraphs 198-205, runtime constraints, runtime algorithms), and define clock synchronizations of the devices by using barrier synchronizations (Hines, Paragraphs 255-261).

15. **Pursuant to claim 7**, Flake et al. (Flake) (US 7,035,781) and/or Bowen (US 6,691,301) do not disclose wherein the program descriptions define the devices by using a "run" method, and define clock synchronizations of the devices by using barrier synchronizations.

16. Hines does disclose wherein the program descriptions define the devices by using a "run" method (Hines, Paragraphs 198-205, runtime constraints, runtime algorithms), and define clock synchronizations of the devices by using barrier synchronizations (Hines, Paragraphs 255-261).

17. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to incorporate barrier synchronizations of Hines in order to enforce synchronization of activities (Hines, Paragraphs 255-261).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Patrick Sandoval whose telephone number is 571-272-7973. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 am to 5:30 pm Monday through Friday.

Art Unit: 2825

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jack Chiang can be reached on 571-272-7483. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Patrick Sandoval
Art Unit 2825



JACK CHIANG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER